



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*THE RELATION OF THE GOSPEL OF MARK TO
PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN TRADITION¹*

WARREN J. MOULTON

BANGOR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The main conclusions that were widely accepted at the close of the last century with reference to the origin of our first three gospels have been confirmed by the investigations of the first decade of the new century. Thoroughgoing re-examinations of the whole problem, such as those of Wellhausen, Burton, and Loisy, have resulted in the reaffirmation of the so-called Theory

¹ Bacon, B. W., *The Beginnings of Gospel Story*. 1909. "A Turning Point in Synoptic Criticism," in the *Harvard Theological Review*, vol. i, 1908, pp. 48-69. "The Purpose of Mark's Gospel," in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xxix, 1910, pp. 41-60.

Bennett, W. H., *The Life of Christ according to St. Mark*. 1907.

Blass, F., *Die Entstehung und der Charakter unserer Evangelien*. 1907.

Bolliger, A., *Marcus der Bearbeiter des Matthäus-Evangeliums*. 1902.

Burkitt, F. C., *The Gospel History and its Transmission*. 1906. *The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus*. 1910.

Burton, E. D., *Some Principles of Literary Criticism and their Application to the Synoptic Problem*. 1904.

Goguel, M., *L'évangile de Marc et ses rapports avec ceux de Mathieu et de Luc*. 1909.

Harnack, A., *Lukas der Arzt*. 1906. (Translated into English: *Luke the Physician*. 1907.) *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*. 1907. (Translated into English: *The Sayings of Jesus*. 1908.)

Hawkins, J. C., *Horae Synopticae*. 2nd ed. 1909.

Hoffmann, R. A., *Das Marcusevangelium und seine Quellen*. 1904.

Jülicher, A., *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. 5th and 6th ed. 1906. (The 2nd ed. is translated into English: *Introduction to the New Testament*. 1904.)

Loisy, A., *Autour d'un petit livre*. 1903. *Les évangiles synoptiques*. Vol. i, 1907; vol. ii, 1908.

Menzies, A., *The Earliest Gospel*. 1901.

Montefiore, C. G., *The Synoptic Gospels*, vols. i and ii. 1909.

Müller, A., *Geschichtskerne in den Evangelien (Marcus und Matthäus)*. 1905.

Nicolardot, F., *Les procédés de rédaction des trois premiers évangélistes*. 1908.

Piepenbring, C., *Jésus historique*. 1909.

Scott-Moncrieff, C. E., *St. Mark and the Triple Tradition*. 1907.

Soden, H. von, "Das Interesse des apostolischen Zeitalters an der evange-

of Two Sources. According to this theory Mark is the earliest of the Synoptic Gospels, and served, in some form, as a documentary source for each of the other two Synoptists, who had, besides Mark, another written source, made up to a large extent of the sayings and teachings of Jesus. The term *Logia* was formerly much used as a designation of this second source, on the supposition that it was to be identified with the writing to which the church father Papias applied that name, but there is now a general disposition to avoid this usage and to employ some more neutral symbol, like the letter Q (*Quelle*, "source").

In spite of the continued dissent of a few eminent scholars, it still remains true that no explanation accounts so fully and so satisfactorily for the whole body of facts involved in the Synoptic Problem as does the hypothesis of two sources. Indeed there is good ground for the oft-repeated assertion that this view has long since passed the hypothetical stage and should now be accounted an established fact. For it is possible to prove not only that Mark served as a source for Matthew and Luke, but further that it supplied to them the outline and framework for their narratives. Why otherwise should all three have generally the same order of

lischen Geschichte" in Theologische Abhandlungen Carl von Weizsäcker gewidmet. 1892. Urchristliche Literaturgeschichte. 1905. (Translated into English: The History of Early Christian Literature. 1906.) Die wichtigsten Fragen im Leben Jesu. 1904.

Spitta, F., Streitfragen der Geschichte Jesu. 1907.

Stanton, V. H., The Gospels as Historical Documents. Part II, The Synoptic Gospels. 1909.

Weiss, B., Die Geschichtlichkeit des Markusevangeliums. 1905. Die Quellen des Lukasevangeliums. 1907. Die Quellen der synoptischen Ueberlieferung. 1908.

Weiss, J., Das älteste Evangelium. 1903.

Wellhausen, J., Das Evangelium Marci. 1903. Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien. 1905.

Wendling, E., Urmarcus. 1905. Die Entstehung des Marcusevangeliums. 1908.

Wendt, H. H., Die Lehre Jesu, vol. i, 1886.

Wernle, P., Die synoptische Frage. 1899. Die Quellen des Lebens Jesu. 1904.

Wrede, W., Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien. 1901.

Wright, A., A Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek. 2nd ed. with introduction, 1903.

Zahn, T., Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 3d ed. 1906-1907. (Translated into English: Introduction to the New Testament, 3 vols., 1909.)

events? Why otherwise should Matthew and Luke, after introducing new material, resume Mark's order? This is done by Luke, for example, after his so-called Greater and Lesser Insertions (6 20-8 7, 9 51-18 14) and by Matthew after the Sermon on the Mount (chapters 5-7). Reasons are usually discernible when transpositions have been made, or at least very plausible ones can be suggested. Dependence on Mark is evidenced, however, not only by the same sequence of events, but also by the same succession of details in most of the incidents which the other Synoptists recount in common with him. The variety that exists in this regard is slight when compared with the general parallelism, and that, too, when there is no evident or inner necessity for any particular order. Again, Mark's vocabulary and turns of expression have been incorporated into the other gospels in considerable measure. This has been done, to be sure, by each writer with much freedom and without abandoning his own literary methods. Luke especially has introduced many changes that are obviously intended to serve the end of clearness and improvement of style, with the result that he actually becomes a commentator on Mark. If it is granted that Mark, in its present form or one that was not essentially different, was used to such an extent and at such an early date by the writers of our first and third gospels, its prime importance is at once evident. The theory of two sources has given it a value that it did not possess under former views as to the origin of the gospels, for ancient tradition and the conclusions of the earliest critical study were not favorable to its priority. Thus Augustine held that it might be an abbreviation of Matthew, and in modern times a kindred view has a distinguished advocate in Professor Zahn. F. C. Baur, founder of the Tübingen School, regarded it as the latest of the Synoptic Gospels and as a colorless excerpt from them, thus accepting in substance the theory that had been put forward by an earlier scholar, Griesbach, and numerous other modern scholars before and since his day are so far in accord with this position that they have made Mark secondary to either one or both of the companion narratives.

But, supposing Mark to have been used as a documentary source by each of the other Synoptists, can we decide whether

they knew it in substantially its present form or in an earlier edition, a primitive Mark, of which the present gospel is the outcome? This question has been much discussed in recent years, and the end is not yet. It must still be regarded as belonging in the category of unsettled problems, notwithstanding the fact that both those who favor and those who oppose the assumption of an earlier form are very positive in their convictions. Decision one way or the other does not materially affect the general estimate of the gospel. It may be said that the majority of scholars at present do not think that the evidence is favorable to such an hypothesis. It is not denied that there have been various textual modifications in Mark, for the manuscript evidence proves that this has been the case no less than in Matthew and Luke, but it is another thing to demand an earlier form that was essentially different, one that was either shorter or longer than our present gospel.²

If it be agreed that Mark possesses relative priority and was a main source for each of the other Synoptic Gospels, we have only reached a notable mile-stone on the way. Other stretches

² The principal reason for assuming the use of an earlier Mark, differing somewhat in form or extent from the present gospel, is the agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark in omissions, additions, and forms of expression. The omissions, estimated at about thirty verses, are particularly perplexing. Why, it is asked, should such a parable as that of the Seed Growing by Itself be omitted (4 26-29), and why the two miracles in 7 32-37 and 8 22-26? Why, in the narrative of the healing of the epileptic boy after the descent from the mount of transfiguration, should the striking conversation with the father of the child be found in Mark only? And why should the indications of chronological progress that stand out so prominently in Mark's account of the last week in Jerusalem be obliterated? Professor Johannes Weiss of Heidelberg feels that the hypothesis of a primitive Mark best accounts for these and like instances. On the other hand, Jülicher, Wernle, and Hawkins, not to mention others who are equally entitled to an opinion, think that the extended omissions can be accounted for more naturally on the ground of consolidation, transposition, or the substitution of other accounts. As for the agreements in expression between Matthew and Luke as over against Mark, they may in some cases be due to the tendency to assimilate one gospel to another.

There is a difference of view among those holding to a primitive Mark as to that gospel's original extent. A fuller text was formerly postulated, and is still contended for by some, but at present it is more usual to assume that Mark, as used by Matthew and Luke, was somewhat briefer than our canonical gospel. R. A. Hoffmann in a recent work (*Das Marcusevangelium und seine Quellen*, 1904) supposes that there were two differing forms of the primitive Mark in Aramaic.

that are beset with greater difficulties and are even more important continue to separate us from the end of our quest. What shall we say of the second gospel as to its historical character and origin? Does it give evidence of being a faithful record of primitive tradition? Does it represent the first attempt of any considerable magnitude to set down the gospel in written form? Or are there indications that it is itself the outcome of a varied and complex antecedent literary activity? It is upon this stage of investigation that we find ourselves entering in earnest in the opening years of the new century. There has of late been a remarkable activity in the work of pioneering and in the reopening of old trails that seems to promise a safe footing for advance. We have no definite information as to how early a beginning was made with written records of Jesus' deeds and teachings, and consequently all kinds of *a priori* conjectures have been hazarded. The year 50 A.D. has been suggested by several writers as a probable date. It is likely that the need of such accounts would not be felt for a considerable time, since oral tradition would suffice for all the demands of teaching and preaching, and from Paul we gain no certain evidence of a written gospel. When, however, we come to the prologue of Luke, we are told that "many had taken in hand to draw up" such narratives. Were some of these writers predecessors of Mark? Schleiermacher in his day had a theory that brief written records formed the basis of our present gospels. For nearly fifty years Professor Bernhard Weiss has steadfastly asserted Mark's dependence on an earlier Discourse-source (Q) that included considerable narrative material. For the rest he supposes the use of oral tradition, namely, communications of Peter. Nearly twenty years ago Professor Wendt of Jena advanced the theory that several independent documents had been used in Mark which represented distinct groups of Petrine tradition. These were combined and commented upon by the author of the second gospel. Professor von Soden of Berlin has for some years held that a Petrine source could be separated out from other later material. But, in general, up to the beginning of the present century few believers in the priority of Mark felt the need of postulating that this gospel, aside from the apocalyptic discourse in chapter 13, rests on written

sources. So Professor Jülicher holds to the essential unity and originality of Mark as regards earlier written sources, as does also Professor Wernle. Professor Schmiedel of Zürich, in his well-known article "Gospels" in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, introduces his paragraph on "Sources of Sources" with the statement that of course except at a few points the use of such earlier written sources cannot be raised above the level of conjecture. Of late, however, it has been affirmed with increasing frequency and emphasis that Mark gives unmistakable evidence of being composite in character, that it rests on sources, no less than Matthew and Luke, that it does not so much inaugurate Christian literary activity as register an important stage in its progress. Mark impresses Professor Zahn, for instance, as a "mosaic carefully constructed out of numerous pieces."

The scholar to whom perhaps more than any other is due the credit of focussing attention on the question of the origin and historical character of the Second Gospel is the late Professor William Wrede, of Breslau. In 1901 he published a book entitled "The Messianic Secret in the Gospels" (*Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*). After stating his acceptance of the theory of two sources, he proceeded to point out that this put on Mark the responsibility of being the main witness for the outline and development of the gospel history. How important, then, to study this gospel in all its parts with utmost care and come to some conclusion about it as a whole! He set forth most forcibly the inadequacy of the prevailing fragmentary, atomistic investigation which dealt only with detached portions of the Synoptic tradition. It was his view that Mark was written at the earliest some thirty years after the events therein recorded, and that this period afforded abundant opportunity for the recasting of tradition. Only in a part of the book, at most, can we assume that we have the memories of an eye-witness, and these come to us as the free reproduction of a narrative the written form of which was separated by a considerable time from its original oral form. He finds that the gospel as a whole gives unmistakable evidence of extensive editorial transformation, and has been adapted and supplemented, in accordance with later dogmatic views, to such an extent that the primitive facts are effectually

obscured. He bases this conclusion on the assumption that Jesus was not regarded as Messiah during his lifetime, but only after his resurrection. Soon after that event, however, it came to be believed that he must have been Messiah already during his earthly ministry. The writer of Mark so teaches, and reconciles this view with the real facts by the theory that Jesus did all that was possible during his life to hide his Messiahship. This is the dominating conception that colors the whole gospel, with the result that it is not so much an historical record of trustworthy recollections regarding Jesus, as a disconnected narrative lacking real progress, and written in the interests of a dogmatic conception of primitive Christian belief. It is not strange that this book created a stir, or that its conclusions should be widely challenged. At the same time it speedily became recognized as a most important contribution to the method of New Testament study. In disproof of Wrede's main conclusion it was pointed out that Mark itself affords the best evidence that it was as Messiah that Jesus was crucified by the Roman authorities. It was also shown how the writer's failure to consider the whole evidence, his reading into the account motives of which the evangelist was probably innocent, and his rigid demand for logical sequence where it could not reasonably be expected, had led him to false deductions. Yet the influence of his discussion has been far-reaching. By provoking dissent it has powerfully stimulated renewed investigation. It has raised in a clear and definite way once and for all the question as to the historical character and origin of Mark.

One of the early results of its appearance was to hasten the publication of a work by Professor Johannes Weiss, which appeared two years later (1903) and has proved to be in some respects one of the most valuable contributions thus far made to the study of the second gospel. Its title, "The Oldest Gospel" (*Das älteste Evangelium*), indicates the writer's view as to the priority of Mark, but he also believes that the gospel is itself based on traditions that had already to some extent assumed written form. Particularly is this thought to be the case with the words of Jesus, which were probably known and used in the churches of that day in a reasonably complete collection. Accord-

ingly, Weiss claims for Mark only that it may represent the earliest attempt to present the apostolic gospel in the form of a narrative of Jesus' life. This does not mean that the motive of the writer is supposed to have been primarily historical or biographical. It was rather a missionary impulse that moved him. He aimed to present that which should be known by those who believed on Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God. He recorded not what was new, but what was known and received under apostolic sanction. Thus we have in Mark the gospel prepared for the service of the missionary church and written down from the point of view of the religious ideas of its author. It is as such that the thorough-going analysis of J. Weiss seeks to understand it.

In Weiss's view a considerable portion of the contents of Mark is derived from reminiscences of Peter, and it is deemed probable that these memories had already taken definite form. Clearly they did not present a connected picture of the daily life of Jesus, but consisted rather of a collection of anecdotes and small narrative groups, giving glimpses of especially significant incidents and experiences in Jesus' life or in Peter's association with him. They presented Jesus as the Son of God, the Chosen One, already equipped on earth with all power and authority and about to come as Messiah. A second group of passages entitled "Party Discussions and Controversies" (*die Schul- und Streit-gespräche*) is also thought to preserve excellent tradition. It is so designated because it has about it a scholastic atmosphere but is not marked by any traits of personal memory that would necessarily connect it with Peter. The description given to a third class of material that Mark has incorporated into his gospel is "Words of Jesus with or without Narrative Setting" (*Worte Jesu mit oder ohne Erzählungsrahmen*). Here are included single sayings and more extended accounts that have parallels in the discourse-material of Matthew and Luke and that do not seem to possess the characteristics of the Petrine narrative. In some few instances Mark may have been dependent on the reminiscences of Peter, while Matthew and Luke on their side used the Discourse-source (Q). So, too, Mark may at such times have drawn also from oral tradition. He evidently did not have so much interest in collecting sayings as in applying them in connection with his nar-

ration after the manner of a teacher or preacher. J. Weiss agrees with his father, B. Weiss, in thus supposing that the evangelist was dependent in considerable measure on the Discourse-source (Q) and that this contained not alone the teaching and sayings of Jesus, but some narratives as well. The method of referring to Jesus' teaching is thought to imply that a reasonably full form of such a source was known to the readers of the second gospel. Finally, in the fourth place, it is held that Mark incorporated into his account some "Secondary Incidental Traditions," which may be old but which are marked by legendary traits. J. Weiss thus finds that in most of its parts Mark is a faithful and trustworthy witness to early Christian tradition. It is not, however, the neutral, comprehensive writing that some have supposed it to be. The selection and grouping of material, the views of Jesus' passion and death, of the province of the gospel, and of the end of the world, show that the writer belonged in temper and interest to the Pauline missionary circle. So far as the symbolical and poetical is present in his narrative, it is to be referred to the material at his disposal rather than to him.

The book of J. Weiss is important because of its soberness and balance, because it gives such abundant evidence of careful investigation, and finally because it frankly recognizes the difficulty and complexity presented by the problem of Mark's sources and the tentative character of any present solution thereof. The author realizes, as some who have followed him have not done, that we are not in a position to advance in this field beyond that which is probable and conjectural.

Professor Julius Wellhausen of Göttingen published a brief commentary on Mark in the same year that Weiss's book appeared (1903). It was followed in rapid succession in the next year by one on Luke and one on Matthew, and finally in 1905 by a compact "Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels" in which Wellhausen presented his conclusions as to their origin and relationship. His view is characterized by a peculiarly high estimate of Mark. It is the gospel *par excellence*, and was retained by the early church, after other gospels, more to the taste of the time, came into existence, on account of the sacredness given it by its age. The writer of Mark, according to Wellhausen, without doubt

intended to be comprehensive and to include in his account all the surviving traditions, the discourse-material no less than the narrative material. There is no reason to assume that he did not set down all that came to him or that he omitted what he knew had been previously recorded. He is least of all a supplementor. Mark is thus made to precede and to be entirely independent of the Discourse-source (Q) used by Matthew and Luke. It is said that the discourse-material developed and changed more in the course of time than did the narrative material. Wellhausen emphasizes the importance of literary attestation as the first standard of authenticity. The spirit of Jesus lived on in the primitive community and not only created a gospel about him, but further developed his ethical teaching—although, to be sure, on the basis he had laid. The ethics of the early church was really the work of Jesus, and that which manifested his spirit appeared to have the value of what he would have said in like circumstances. This view of Wellhausen as to the later and secondary character of the Discourse-source (Q) is regarded by many as one of the weak points in his investigation and can hardly be said to have withstood the arguments that have been urged against it by Jülicher, Harnack, Bousset, and others. He agrees that Mark's aim was not to describe the life and person of Jesus, but rather to show that he was the Christ. As this was the interest of Mark, so it was the interest of his day, and thus an explanation is found of why oral tradition had shrunk to such small proportions. Although Mark is the oldest gospel, yet its contents do not give evidence of coming directly from the intimate companions of Jesus. The narrative seems rather to have taken shape in popular tradition after a considerable course from mouth to mouth. The evangelist took up the anecdotal material and arranged it in three divisions (chapters 1-5, 6-10, 11-16). His work included further a certain amount of editing, the adding of introductions, conclusions, transitions, short summaries, lists, and sketches of such addresses of Jesus as by exception were not linked on to events. Oral tradition might be expected to be incoherent, and to contain varying accounts and parts belonging to various stages of development, but this consideration does not serve to explain all unevennesses

of form and content in Mark. A revision of the first writing has taken place, and sections of a secondary historical character have been added. Whether they are also secondary as to their literary form Wellhausen does not believe that we are often in a position to decide. As used by Matthew and Luke, Mark had substantially its present form, though they may have been able to consult also an Aramaic original. The defence of the theory of an Aramaic original for our gospel is perhaps Wellhausen's most valuable contribution to the discussion of Mark. There are few living scholars who are so well qualified as he to pronounce on this point. The proof that he advances does not consist so much in single phrases and isolated examples as in a combination of facts that prove the presence of an underlying Semitic syntax and style. This might possibly come through the use of oral Aramaic tradition, but it is far more probable that Mark was first written in this language. The place of writing would then probably be Jerusalem, and the date some time after the capture of the city by the Romans.

While Wellhausen indicates sections in Mark that he regards as secondary in their historical character, he does not believe that it is possible to separate out a primitive Mark or to trace stages of revision in the gospel. This had been attempted previously, and was undertaken anew in a work the first part of which appeared in the same year with Wellhausen's "Introduction." It is a small volume by Dr. Emil Wendling bearing the title "Primitive Mark" (*Urmarcus*), and described in the subtitle as an attempt to recover the oldest accounts of the life of Jesus. The author is the principal of the Gymnasium in Zabern, and is a specialist in classical philology rather than in theology. He disavows any particular doctrinal or religious interest, and says that he reaches his conclusions as a philologist, employing solely the methods of literary criticism. He finds that an earlier and a later source are present in the gospel, and indicates each, in printing the Greek text, by the use of different forms of type. From these two sources he distinguishes a series of additions, made by the final editor, which he brings together and prints in a section by themselves. Three years later, in 1908, a larger companion volume gave in detail the grounds for the earlier analysis. A third

part is contemplated, to deal with the vocabulary of the different sources, as well as with their historical character and value. It may be doubted whether what has thus far appeared will incline Wellhausen to a more favorable view of such an undertaking.

It is possible to speak here of some of the general conclusions only. Wendling tells us that he began his investigations with the study of chapter 4, where there seems to be unmistakable evidence of the presence of material from different hands. One hand is that of the editor, who is the real evangelist. His presence is said to be traceable in some sections preceding the chapter in question and in much that follows. In all, more than a third of the gospel is assigned to him. A study of his additions reveals him to be a dogmatist, and an awkward narrator, who in an unskilful way has imposed upon the simple historical narrative, or rather inserted into it, his theory of the mystical, allegorical character of Jesus' parables. He is credited with taking over and confusedly blending motives that belong to older material in the gospel. He generalizes and exaggerates. He seeks to have Jesus give instruction regarding pressing questions of the community life. The entire section, chapters 6 45-8 45, is thought to come from him by reason both of its form and content. It is he who took over sayings from the Discourse-source (Q) used by Matthew and Luke. He had a pronounced eschatological interest, and introduced most of the discourse of chapter 13 and also the designation "Son of Man." Where he uses older traditions he may transmit valuable information, but his own adaptations are serviceable only for ascertaining the conceptions, hopes, and desires of his own age.

The two main strata, which are the further outcome of the writer's analysis of the gospel, are assigned to two writers designated as M¹ and M². The latter (M²) made large additions to the composition of his predecessor (M¹). Especially is this true of the narratives of Jesus' miracles and of sayings intimately connected with some historical situation. This later writer has a joy in narration, and sees events not so much with the eyes of a historian as with the imagination and faith of a poet. He is farther removed from actual events than his predecessor (M¹) and views them in a transfigured light. He enlarged the historical

and geographical setting of the narrative that came to him, but kept the old order of events. He has given to the second gospel its reputation for vividness and liveliness. He too, like the third hand and final editor, takes over and uses in a new way themes of earlier narratives, but he does it with a skill, appreciation, and poetical touch that were lacking in that writer. He likewise makes use of Old Testament examples. He was probably in contact with living tradition regarding Jesus, even if we cannot succeed in uncovering the historical kernel in his narratives. He is, moreover, a valuable witness to the views of an age that was still permeated with Jesus' spirit, but he is less valuable than M¹, or than the evangelist, for information regarding the events of Jesus' life.

The original writer (M¹) was of a different character. Whereas M² may be called the poet of the gospel, and the evangelist the dogmatist, he may be called the historian. For he aims to reproduce from faithful memory the spiritual content of unforgettable experiences. There is little of the Messianic in him, and Jesus' sayings have the form of apothegms. His style is simple, clear, and concise. The material that Wendling assigns to this writer corresponds in considerable part to that which Professor von Soden refers to his Petrine source. In the investigations of von Soden Wendling seems to have found much suggestion, particularly in the contrast pointed out by that writer between the terse narrative in 1 14-4 34 and the amplitude that characterizes the three following incidents, 4 35-5 43. Such a narrative as that of M¹ may well have been, it is thought, a first attempt to record in a continuous account the memories of Jesus' life, beginning with the Galilean experiences and ending with the passion. The fundamental plan of the Gospel of Mark would then go back to this first writer, although his successor, M², did much to give the book its chronological appearance, and the evangelist on his part also added new journeys and incidents.

Many suggestive observations are to be found in Wendling, but his method as a whole is too subjective and lacks real foundation. The canon of style and of literary character is not equal to the burden that he seeks to impose upon it. What is called a philological and literary investigation is evidently governed largely

by dogmatic presuppositions. The theory of doublets is carried to an unreasonable extreme.³

Of much greater importance are two works of recent date. The first, and the more comprehensive in its scope, is a commentary on the Synoptic Gospels, in two volumes with a total of more than 1800 pages, by Professor Alfred Loisy. In the introduction (pages 1-268) the author reviews previous investigations, and also gives his own conclusions as to the origin and development of the Synoptic records. His discussion of Mark and of its relation to primitive Christian tradition is of particular interest, for it is written with a large knowledge of what has been previously wrought out in this field and brings together the results, old and new, which he accepts.

Loisy believes that our present Mark is removed several stages from the incidents therein recounted. It does not rest solely on oral tradition, nor does it represent memories that were guarded solely by eye-witnesses, any more than do the other gospels. He thinks that the fact that Matthew and Luke made use of written sources would of itself suggest that Mark did the same, and this presupposition is found to be confirmed by a careful examination of that gospel. The real author is the editor, or redactor, who used the material at his disposal to produce a work that is very far from being a biography, but is rather a didactic or catechetical demonstration of the Messiahship of Jesus. Loisy agrees with Wellhausen and others that the oldest apostolic traditions were probably of the same type.

³ For example, it is held that the incident of the healing of the demoniac in the synagogue in the original account of M¹ has furnished the motive to M² in the account of the stilling of the tempest (4 35-41) and also in that of the Gadarene demoniac (5 1-20), and supplied to the evangelist a motive for the story of the visit to Nazareth (6 1-6). This last-named paragraph contains, further, a duplication of 3 31 f., where there is a reference to Jesus' family. Evidence is also found that use has been made here of the Discourse-source (Q). At the same time the account is said to have upon it the impress of Paulinism. That, in spite of this, the whole trend of the incident seems to accord so poorly with the dogmatic tendencies of the evangelist is explained on the ground that the original saying implied Jesus' impotence to heal in a specific case. And, again, it is said that the writer does maintain his view by referring the lack of success to the people of Nazareth. Finally, it is asserted that the evangelist gives the incident as a particularly convincing example of the hardening of Israel. Such results do not commend the method.

That which was remembered and preached was what corresponded to Jesus' character as Messiah and was suited to edify believers. It will accordingly be hard, if not impossible, to distinguish between personal impression or memory and traditional interpretation, inference, idealization, or amplification. All was not false in the mythical hypothesis of Strauss, but the work of tradition has been much more complex and varied than that critic supposed. Difficult and delicate as is the task, the historian must seek to discriminate between that which represents the immediate action of the Saviour on those who had known him and that which represents his mediate action; that is to say, between the nucleus of primitive memories concerning his career and teaching and the progressive elaboration of the same in Christian preaching, in the ardent imagination of those who had believed on him through the testimony of other believers, and in the editing of evangelical records. Primitive recollections were idealized and enlarged into symbols of doctrine. Simple miracles of faith have been transformed into Messianic arguments and are recounted and interpreted as allegories in action. Loisy holds that there may have been an historical basis in most cases, but says that in many instances we are no longer in a position to decide whether this is true or whether a metaphor or a parable may not have been the real point of departure, or whether a sentiment of faith may not have been transformed into a material symbol. There may, for instance, have been a real incident back of the stilling of the storm (4 35-41), but, in his opinion, it is not probable that the same can be assumed for the walking on the sea (6 45-52). So, too, the account of the blind man at Jericho (10 46-52) may be purely legendary or symbolical. The two duplicate accounts of the multiplication of the loaves give symbolical instruction on a theme derived from the Old Testament. There is little probability that either of these accounts had a place in the preaching of an apostle, although they may have been put into circulation before the death of Peter and the leading apostles. Loisy thinks it may be questioned whether there is any historical incident back of the account of the transfiguration, which is now so evidently symbolical. In the narrative of the events of the last week in Jeru-

saalem there have been many additions and modifications that are calculated to show that Jesus was the Messiah, who by his death was to fulfil prophecy and accomplish the salvation of the world. How far these are due to the evangelist and how far they are due to a preceding development may not be easy to decide. Loisy thinks that the evangelist's hand is especially responsible for much in the account of the burial of Jesus and of the discovery of the empty tomb, and that such an account could be written only after most of the eye-witnesses of the gospel history had disappeared. So the account of the trial before Caiaphas and of the release of Barabbas, which are so evidently apologetic, could hardly, he thinks, have been written before Caiaphas, Pilate, and the apostles had quitted the scene of history. The trial before Pilate, on the other hand, rests upon good historical foundation. He follows Keim in holding that the incident of the young man who fled away at the time of Jesus' arrest (14 51 f.) goes back primarily to the prophecy in Amos 2 16. All that follows Mark 15 40 may be due to the same hand that wrote 14 28, and this hand is called that of the last redactor.

As in the case of the narrative material, so also in the case of Jesus' teaching, Loisy finds evidence of extensive modification and amplification. Much of Jesus' teaching was lost, and that which survived existed in the form of short, incisive sentences, vivid comparisons, and pointed narratives. That alone was retained which was of practical utility and was directly suited to contribute to the edification of believers and the progress of the new religion. Its use to this end gave it a didactic, catechetical form. The text of the parables seems to have been less carefully guarded than that of the sayings. The allegorizing of them went on in a way that would be possible only for a generation that had not received the direct impression. Some parables may have been created, just as new sayings came into existence. An illuminating illustration of how this might come to pass in all good faith is found in the way Paul recounts Jesus' words at the Last Supper in 1 Corinthians 11 23 f. It may be remarked in passing that there is good reason for seriously questioning Loisy's exegesis of this passage.

What has been said shows the large place that historical criticism plays in Loisy's decisions. He recognizes the difficulty of literary analysis, when we are no longer in possession of an older source or sources that were probably used by the second evangelist, but still he thinks that a careful examination of the writing itself will afford us sufficient data. Mere absence of cohesion will not, indeed, suffice as a basis for analysis in a work that is so little literary in its character, but positive incoherence, and the correspondence of parts actually separated, will enable us to make trustworthy deductions. If there is lack of harmony between contiguous bits that come from different streams of ideas, if we find an accumulation of incongruous data that can be divided into homogeneous groups, each of which is characterized by its own inspiring motive, if we find double accounts of the same events, we shall be justified in assuming that we have here, as in other works possessing like characteristics, the combination of traditions or of written sources, and the complexity of redactional work. It is thus that in his commentary Loisy seeks to distinguish between what is really primitive and what is to be attributed to development and to editing. The first element will be important for the history of Jesus, whereas the last will enable us to recognize the tendencies, the aim, and even the personality of the editor himself.

When Loisy comes to his recapitulation of the residuum of historical facts embodied in the Synoptic Gospels, we find that it makes a substantial outline of Jesus' ministry. He accepts the theory of two sources, and distinguishes between the narratives of Jesus' deeds and his teachings. The Galilean ministry in and about Capernaum may have lasted a few weeks or a few months. Jesus' popularity almost affrighted him. He chose twelve and sent them out, because the Kingdom was to fulfil the promises of God to Israel. Loisy does not believe that Jesus' Messianic consciousness was a development. The time was too short, and the experiences after the first popularity were too unfavorable. He began his ministry with the conviction that he was to have a chief place in the coming Kingdom. The main contribution of experience would be an understanding of the chances that the Messiah would enter into his glory through death. Jesus main-

tained silence as to his Messiahship, because he was not such in reality, but was the one to whom this function belonged. After the retirement to the North and East he went to Jerusalem, not to die, but at the risk of his life to prepare for and procure God's coming. He knew the danger, but, if the Kingdom could only come through his death, the price was not too dear. To save his life was to lose it. Still he did not cease to expect the immediate consummation of the Kingdom. The Messianic manifestation on the Mount of Olives, if it rests on historical fact, would indicate that the time was near. So, too, his words at the supper with the faithful in the house of Simon the leper, which was really the Last Supper, do not signify that his death was at hand, but only that a radical change was impending. The Kingdom may be there tomorrow. Judas possibly saw the hopelessness of the cause. Jesus did avow his Messiahship before Pilate. If he used the terms Son of God and Son of Man, it could have been only on rare occasions at an advanced stage of his ministry, and in a sense that made them synonymous with Messiah. We cannot assume that he expected his death, but only that he contemplated its possibility, and this he can hardly have done without thinking of the resurrection.

The disciples probably fled to Galilee after the encounter in the garden, and we do not know that one of them continued in Jerusalem after Jesus' death. The empty tomb is regarded by Loisy as a probable close of the original account. The writer might well have regarded this as a conclusive proof of the resurrection. The stories of the appearances of the risen Lord given in the other gospels are really duplicate accounts of the Markan narrative. It may be that the account of the transfiguration was intended to supplement the record of the empty tomb, the aim being to correct the scandal of Jesus' death by an anticipation of his glory.

With reference to the redactor of the second gospel, Loisy agrees with the view that he was a Paulinist; that is, he may have been a disciple of Paul, and was in any event his great admirer, or, better still, his great partisan. Many evidences are found of his zeal for Paul and of his defence of him. It is suggested that the incident of the stranger exorcist (9 38 ff.) may have been

imagined in Paul's behalf. His gospel is a consciously Pauline interpretation of primitive tradition. Though of Jewish origin, he takes a decided stand against the Jews, and looks on them as devoted in a body to destruction. So, too, it can be said that he almost takes sides against the Galilean apostles, so much does he do to set forth their lack of intelligence and courage, especially the former. He was not an inhabitant of Jerusalem, and does not seem bound by his own memories or by information received from eye-witnesses. He dogmatizes as Paul does, and treats his sources with as much freedom as does the author of the fourth gospel, only he does it in a more superficial way, to demonstrate the Messiahship of Jesus. So also he makes notable additions to serve his didactic, apologetic, and polemic purposes. It is inconceivable that the writer was through long years the friend, disciple, and confidant of Peter, but he may have received a series of memories from the apostle, or may have made use of a source that came from one who stood in close relation to him. In any event it is certain that Peter had a preponderating part in the formation of apostolic catechetics. Thereby at least the fundamental tradition of the evangelical history goes back to him.

It is difficult to distinguish between what must be regarded as the memories of Peter and what may have come from the Discourse-source (Q). Both of these expressed the memories and the faith of the primitive community without the influence of Pauline theology. The Galilean apostles appeared there as the authorized witnesses for the life of Christ and for his teaching. Primitive apologetic would have the task of explaining Jesus' condemnation by Rome and his death. The apostles, accordingly, would not at first preach the history of Jesus, or any theme fixed by him, but their thought would centre, as did that of Paul, about his passion and resurrection. Proof would be sought in the Scriptures. Following this would come the need of showing that Jesus' ministry and teaching was such as befitted the Christ. We may conjecture that a written record of the principal sayings of Jesus, of which the apostolic generation guarded the memory, would be made relatively early. It is possible, though not certain, that this might be in Aramaic. So there may have been an early record of Jesus' ministry and passion, either joined

to the Discourse-source (Q) or, more probably, distinct from it. The first redaction of these documents would be considerably before 70 A.D., though one ought not to go much farther back than 50 A.D. These were small, catechetical works, implements of the apostolate, which had become useful, even indispensable, to Christian preachers who had not listened to the Saviour. These writings would be much copied, corrected, and amplified according to need. The collection of sayings grew rich in new sentences and the historical narrative in new anecdotes. The most ancient attempt that has come down to us to join the accounts together in a single book of instruction is the Gospel of Mark, which ought probably to be dated shortly after 70 A.D. It is an insufficient sketch and presupposes the preservation of a collection of discourse-material, whereas the compilers who follow sought to include all the traditional material in one book.

Shortly after the publication of Loisy's volumes, the second book above referred to appeared. It is a brief commentary on the Gospel of Mark by Professor B. W. Bacon, and is designed for English readers, but evidently for those who have busied themselves to a considerable extent with the Synoptic Problem. Besides the critical discussions that precede each section of exegetical comments, short introductions to the first and second parts of the book give in a summary way Professor Bacon's conclusions regarding the origin and historical character of the second gospel. Had these two introductions been combined, the change might possibly have contributed to a readier understanding of his view as to the actual course of Jesus' life. Although working in entire independence of Loisy, he is in agreement with him at many important points. He, too, believes that an early, simple narrative, which, by reason not only of tradition, but also of its own intrinsic characteristics, may be appropriately designated as Petrine, has been interpolated and embellished by a Paulinist whom we need not suppose to have had even a modicum of acquaintance with any one of the twelve. The Petrine element lies very far back and shows itself in spite of the evangelist rather than by his intention. It seems perhaps to have been already too firmly fixed to admit of radical

recasting. One of the sources drawn upon very largely to embellish and supplement the fundamental narrative was the Discourse-source (Q) used by Matthew and Luke. The material taken therefrom has not been joined on in any mechanical way, but is introduced in what often seem to be memoriter interpolations and supplements. Bacon thinks that the editor at times derives his narrative additions from a special form of the Lukan source (Q^{Lk}). In a few instances he supposes that the special Matthean form of this source was used (Q^{Mt}). Appropriate symbols, written in the margin beside the English translation, indicate Bacon's judgment as to the origin of the Markan narrative. He goes much beyond Loisy in the definiteness with which he seeks to determine this, every verse and phrase being accounted for, after the manner of the analysis of Wendling.

Bacon also goes beyond Loisy and most predecessors in the extent to which he finds the gospel dominated by Paulinism. The evidence adduced in proof of this is manifold. There is, first, a succession of incidents and utterances that are extremely anti-legalistic and anti-judaistic. A series of conflicts emphasizes Jesus' independence, and the independence of his disciples, of Jewish religious observances. The whole ceremonial system of Mosaism is denounced as "doctrines and precepts of men" (7 7). Marital relations countenanced by Mosaism are denounced as adultery (10 1-12). The Pauline apologetic of Israel's unbelief is adopted (4 11, 12). The way in which the various sayings and incidents are toned down, and even transformed, when transcribed in the parallel accounts of Matthew and Luke, makes the spirit of Pauline radicalism present in Mark all the more evident. Further, the attitude exhibited toward Jesus' kindred and toward the members of the apostolic circle is ultra-pauline. Peter is subordinated and repeatedly appears in an unfortunate light. The account of Jesus' appearance to him after the resurrection and of his "turning again" and "strengthening his brethren" (Luke 22 32) has been modified by the evangelist and finally omitted. Against the claims to primacy or authority for James and John and the rest of the twelve, he seems "to find the sharpest phrases all too weak." Peter, James, and

John never appear individually save for purposes of rebuke. Collectively, in the capacity of martyr apostles, they are, on three occasions, the exclusive witnesses of Jesus' conflict with the power of death. Finally, the positive and conclusive reason for regarding the second evangelist as an extreme Paulinist is the manner in which he conceives of his task. He seeks simply to produce belief in Jesus' person as the Son of God. He leaves his readers completely without information as to the law of Jesus, though he certainly was not ignorant of the teachings and commandments of the law. He does not give the content of Jesus' message until we come to the section 8 27-10 52, and here it is the Pauline principle of the doctrine of the cross. The evangelist's whole conception of what constitutes the apostolic message is the supreme manifestation of his Paulinism. He is dominated by theoretical considerations, and does not give evidence of a sympathetic and appreciative understanding of the real course of history.

The adjectives that Bacon repeatedly employs to describe the method and motive of the evangelist are "aetiological" and "apologetic." By the first is meant that the primary attempt is never to write history, but to explain and justify the beliefs and practices of the contemporary church by means of the tradition of its origin. Hence the proper approach for understanding the gospel in its present form is an acquaintance with the real and practical problems of gentile Christian life between 70 and 90 A.D. This knowledge is to be gained, before all else, from a study of the great epistles of Paul,—Romans, Corinthians, Galatians. The evangelist strings together groups of anecdotes from the story of Jesus to illustrate five general themes: (1) Baptism and Gifts of the Spirit; (2) the Ministry in its two functions of teaching and healing; (3) the Agapé and its symbolism of the bread of life; (4) the institution of the Church; and (5) the Eucharist. In undertaking an investigation of the gospel, the thing first of all to be looked for is the motive prompting the narration, and this is usually transparent enough when the conditions of the churches are understood. The unveiling, step by step, of the motives that led the evangelist to choose, mould, and rearrange his material, and in some few instances practically

to create it, is the most prominent feature of Bacon's commentary. He does not give to the independent, creative activity of the writer so large scope as does Loisy, but goes far beyond him in assigning motives for the redactional activity. Bacon also differs widely from Loisy in method and in the kind of motives assumed. He accepts in its essence the *tendenz*-method of Baur, holding, "first," that "the gospels are ecclesiastical formulations of the traditions, and must be interpreted as the products of their time," and, secondly, that "the issues of that time must be defined by independent scrutiny of the great Pauline epistles."⁴ In addition to this source we have as a means for controlling and correcting the account of the second gospel the material taken from the Discourse-source (Q), and from the special source of Luke (Q^{Lk}).

The story of the real course of Jesus' life which results from Bacon's analysis of the second gospel and from the comparison with all other known sources, is not as full as the sketch of Loisy, and differs from it considerably in fundamental points and also in details. "Jesus was a wage-earner of Nazareth, an ideal representative of that simple piety exemplified in the earlier type of Pharisaism unspoiled as yet by the ecclesiasticism of the synagogue system." "His public career began as a consequence of the violent interruption of the work of John" (the Baptist). In his message he went beyond John's summons to repentance and proclaimed the assurance of forgiveness. There is little in Mark to explain the popular support that gave to the movement of Jesus its Messianist character, but from the special source of Luke (Q^{Lk}) we get the needed information which is the key to the whole career of Jesus. This is his championship of the cause of the lost sheep of the house of Israel, his yearning to seek and to save that which was lost. God worked with him in preaching and healing, but the evangelist has transformed the character of the miracles by introducing marvellous features and thaumaturgic traits to prove Jesus' divine sonship. A collision with the synagogue authorities was inevitable from the first. Excluded from Galilee, no choice was left him but the transference of his mission to Judea, for there could be no thought of abandoning the cause

⁴ Harvard Theological Review, vol. i, p. 65.

of the lost sons of Israel, and systematic activity among the Gentiles is not likely to have entered his mind. There are indications that the primitive Petrine narrative told how Jesus at this juncture "assumed in the confidential circle of the Twelve the wholly new rôle and title of 'the Christ,'" not in its later meaning but in its original sense of "the expected Deliverer," "who brings Israel into its predestined relation of sonship to God." In any case he "*did* go up to Jerusalem" and "*did* follow a rôle that led to his execution by Pilate as a *political* agitator." Shortly afterward his followers "*did* ascribe to him not mere reappearance from the tomb, but exaltation to the place of the Messiah 'at the right hand of God'—attributes so exalted that it is difficult to believe they had no other foundation than mere reverence for an admired teacher. No; from the moment of his *coup d'état* upon the Temple, Jesus' career passes beyond that of a mere rabbi or even prophet." Still, Bacon thinks it is a question whether Jesus admitted the application to himself of strictly Messianic titles and attributes. It could only be "in a purely ethico-religious sense, and only for the preservation of that deepest and most vital element of the Messianic hope—the *sonship* of Israel." "Even if Jesus himself regarded his calling as in some remote sense Messianic, historical criticism may reasonably question whether the direct claim of his Messiahship would ever have been put forth by his disciples had it not first appeared as a malignant imputation of his mortal enemies, in the charge by which they secured his crucifixion from a complacently cruel governor." It is a question "whether, up to the crucifixion itself, the prophet of Nazareth had been seriously regarded as 'the Christ' by even the most ardent disciple." However, the account of the anointing in 14 3-9 is cited as old and as possibly indicating Messianic faith. It was when Jesus was excluded from Galilee, and when he set his face toward Judea, that a new phase of his activity began "which inevitably led to a Messianic outcome, even if he himself had neither the expectation nor ambition of being proclaimed 'the Christ.'" "He foresaw martyrdom, vindicated not by *his own* Coming again, but by the Coming of the Danielic Son of Man." This was to take place "while the evil generation still lived that had slain God's messengers." Jesus could not have used Son of

Man as a favorite self-designation to describe himself as one who was to be brought back from the underworld on the clouds of heaven. The Son of Man of whom he speaks "is simply the conventional figure, not necessarily himself, who is to be the agent of God's vindication in the coming judgment." The view that we find in the gospel is that of the enthusiastic church. Such apocalyptic fanaticism was characteristic of Pharisaism and of the later generation of Jesus' followers, but not "of the sane and well-poised mind of the plain mechanic of Nazareth." Peter, whose stumbling had been most conspicuous, was the first to be converted and after that to strengthen his brethren. It is in his beholding of the risen Christ in apocalyptic glory that the church has its beginning. Bacon would date the second gospel somewhere between 70 and 75 A.D.

Numerous other books that concern themselves more or less directly with the problems of Mark have been published recently, but those already mentioned have perhaps attracted most attention. They have certainly given a new importance and a new interest to the study of the second gospel. This will be granted even by those who still think that we are without sufficient data for determining the exact course of the development of tradition antecedent to Mark, as also by those who continue unshaken in their conviction that there was no development. Of the investigations not previously alluded to which have an important bearing on the present theme, those by the elder Weiss are particularly noteworthy. He develops a view of Luke's special source that would give it a prominent place in the list of primitive authorities and would put us in possession of a Jewish-Christian standard, emanating from Jerusalem, that might be used along with the Discourse-source (Q) for testing and measuring Mark. It is hardly possible at present to forecast the future development of the study of the Synoptic Gospels or to decide how much of the work that has been recently done will prove to be a permanent contribution. Past experience teaches that the large agreement among the writers that we have reviewed as to the character of the Markan sources does not of itself prove the correctness of their general position. No more does their wide divergence in matters of detail disprove their whole method. They have at least

established, with a clearness never before attained, that the second gospel in its structure, compass, and points of view presents problems that call for solution. These problems will continue to challenge the best efforts of Christian scholarship until satisfactory explanations have been found or every resource has been exhausted. Even if the recent discussions shall be held to be inadequate, earnest students of the gospels will not cease to feel their great indebtedness to the patient labor and the rich, devout scholarship of the expert workers in this difficult field. And it must be said that, notwithstanding the marked progress that has been made in many phases of the investigation of the second gospel, it may still be doubted whether we have reached a point where the exact sources upon which it depends can be determined. Possibly this can never be done, even approximately. The whole problem is more difficult and more baffling than some recent discussions might lead one to suppose. That written records lie back of various portions of the Gospel, besides chapter 13 and other discourse-paragraphs, seems *a priori* not unlikely, though it may not be easy to supply certain proof of it. That the writer also used such oral tradition as was suited to his purpose is likewise very probable, though it may be impossible to bring oneself to believe that a gospel of such fulness and completeness could spring into being as a first product of the movement to record oral tradition. The probability seems to be that the second gospel depends in all its parts upon one or the other of these sources, but no written record employed by the evangelist, so far as we know, has survived, and this is the great hindrance which up to the present has not been successfully overcome. Professor Burkitt has pointed out (*The Gospel History and Its Transmission*, pp. 123 and 131) that it is very doubtful whether we could recover Mark if it had been preserved only as a component part of Matthew and Luke. And yet this might be supposed to be an easier task than the reconstruction of one of Mark's own main sources on the basis of internal evidence alone. It has so far proved impossible to get anything like a consensus of opinion regarding the exact form of the Discourse-source (Q), even though we are fortunate enough to possess two documents in which it is supposedly incorporated, and even though we can make some

reasonably certain deductions as to the style and methods of the writers of these documents. The attempts at the literary analysis of other New Testament books, particularly the Book of Acts, where we are also without parallels or any proper basis for comparison, are not of a character to make one hopeful of the outcome in Mark. None of the schemes reviewed, or that have thus far been propounded, promises to be widely accepted, because the evidence is too inadequate and too conflicting. The demonstration hardly ever rises, for any considerable portion of the gospel, above the level of plausible conjecture. The more definite and detailed the scheme, the more questionable it has always proved to be.

The writer of the second gospel apparently did not feel any sense of proprietorship in his material. He nowhere suggests that he is giving testimony as an eye-witness or as the exclusive possessor of important information. He does not feel the necessity, as do the writers of the third and fourth gospels, of making any statement as to his sources. That about which we inquire in this respect was either self-evident or not likely to be of interest to his readers. Apart from ancient tradition, it would hardly occur to any one to suppose that Peter was the exclusive authority for what is narrated. In parts he is a prominent figure, and what is said often centres round his experiences, while certain accounts are most naturally explained as proceeding ultimately from what he recounted; but this is by no means true of the whole gospel. There is much that might possibly go back to his reminiscences, but it might go back equally well to other sources. A literary unity runs through the second gospel, notwithstanding its fragmentary, anecdotal character. We can understand how this might be, for the procedure of the other evangelists and of other New Testament writers, so far as this is discoverable, makes it probable that the sources have not been literally reproduced, but have been treated with great freedom. A clew to the writer's method and characteristics has been sought in the few passages where he speaks in his own person, but they are hardly sufficient to supply this. The editorial comments are in indirect form, and usually appear as admonitions, or as applications of what has been recorded, or as explanations of what might be strange to non-

jewish readers. Nicolardot has recently endeavored to throw light on the evangelist's method by the study of the way in which the Discourse-source (Q) was probably used by him. This is a legitimate procedure, for it is more widely recognized than ever that this source existed early and probably made its contribution to the second gospel. But too much is likely to remain problematical regarding its form and extent, and particularly regarding the form in which it was known and employed by the second evangelist, to make us hopeful of large results from such a method of approach. It cannot be counted strange, in view of what has thus far been achieved, that Wellhausen should doubt whether sections that he regards as of secondary historical character can also be shown to be secondary as regards their literary form.

We have seen that the two most recent writers, Loisy and Bacon, have been guided in their analyses more by the content of the gospel than by its form. And this was also true of Johannes Weiss. The so-called "historico-critical" method has been adopted. The effort has been to observe what is inharmonious or disconnected, to separate out related points of view, and to arrange in order the resulting bodies of material. The difficulty and delicacy of such a task is self-evident. There is always danger that the age, ancestry, and relation of conceptions be mistaken, or that they be made tenants of dwellings not built for their habitation. There is the further possibility that such ideas may have been at home in more than one mind or one community. If the presence of certain forms of the miraculous is made a basis for judgment, it may be questioned whether this of itself gives evidence of the late date which these writers suppose. The position of Harnack is truer,—namely, that modern views of the miraculous cannot be made a criterion to decide what early writers could or could not believe. They looked out of their own eyes, and not through those of men living today. Furthermore, the classification of the contents of the gospel according to our estimate of its character, and the supposition that we can thus establish what stood in different sources, are very questionable. Why may not material of diverse character have had its place in any or all of the evangelist's sources, as well as in his own narrative and in his

own mind? Indeed, after an interval of thirty or forty years, during which it may be presumed that all disciples, even those who had companied with the Master, listened eagerly to all that could be learned, would it not be strange if there were not a mingling of tradition? This remains true, whether we assume that the sources were written, or hold that the evangelist was dependent upon what was treasured in the memory of his informants. Is it probable that interblending could begin only with him? Even such a seemingly certain criterion for analysis as the presence of parallel accounts of the same event may fail us, when there are no other weighty supplemental considerations. Why, for example, should our writer necessarily be the first who failed to identify accounts so evidently duplicate as those of the two feedings of the multitude?

If now to other more or less elusive considerations we add that of the evangelist's interest and purpose, do we get a better basis for our analysis and for properly relating the second gospel to what went before? There is general agreement that the evangelist did not write as a chronicler whose primary interest was to record events. The gospel is far from being a chronicle, or a complete record of Jesus' ministry, and it is hardly conceivable that it could have been the writer's purpose to make it such. It has been estimated that we have incidents from not more than forty of the four hundred days that may be taken as the shortest possible estimate of the duration of Jesus' ministry. What might naturally be anticipated appears actually to have happened. Characteristic and noteworthy incidents and experiences were the ones that were remembered and afterwards most frequently recounted. What the writer seems to present to his readers is a series of brief, often unconnected, sketches of impressive incidents suited to awaken and strengthen faith by acquainting the reader with what was important for understanding the course and development of Jesus' ministry in the light of its outcome. Particular interest is manifested in the close of that ministry and in the last week in Jerusalem. The view that this is the real theme, and that all that is told besides is intended to be contributory thereto, is not an altogether false estimate. The order is, on the whole, chronological, and was evidently intended to be so.

There is a sketch of the early days and the work in Galilee, of the gathering of followers, of the opposition of enemies, of retirement, of the journey to Jerusalem, and of the closing days, but within this general framework the grouping is often topical or suggested by some like principle of association. So far as we can judge, other arrangements of the material would have been equally possible. There is nowhere a statement as to purpose, and yet at the beginning and throughout there seems to be an unmistakable aim, which may be defined as an effort to quicken and confirm faith in Jesus as Messiah, the Son of God. What in the writer's view would best contribute to this end seems to have been singled out for narration. In so far the presence of a tendency may be recognized; and even beyond this, in the adaptation of the narrative to the needs and understanding of the writer's age. To the extent that this was the method of Baur, that method may be said to remain, but to go beyond this and make the controversies, difficulties, and institutions of the early church, or specifically of the church at Rome from 70 to 90 A.D., the key to the contents of the gospel, as is done in Bacon's aetiological method, is another matter. The weighty objections to such a procedure are, of course, not unknown to him, for they have been urged with telling effect against like explanations in the past. The question is whether he has reduced them to silence. One can still hardly avoid the conviction that the motives and tendencies which he discovers in many of the narratives are first read into them, and that a naïve evangelist would be greatly surprised at much of the subtlety that is imputed to him. If what is presented with much brilliancy and suggestiveness is often possible, there are nearly always other possibilities at least equally near at hand. Then, too, the Aramaic foundation and background, if not the Aramaic original, of the evangelical material, is not sufficiently reckoned with. The presence of this element promises to continue one of the strongest arguments against the late date to which much of the Gospel of Mark is assigned by both Loisy and Bacon. It is not possible to limit it to the Discourse-source (Q), as though this alone were Syrian and the narrative matter Roman. But if the gospel tradition took shape in such large measure on the soil of Palestine, it was not at the period nor within the sphere of

influence postulated by the aetiological theory. No more would it originate in the devout faith of a later evangelist. Again, is it supposable that a gospel could have won such general acceptance, displaced other tradition, and become the foundation for writers soon to follow, if it was made up to such an extent of material that had come into being, or had been entirely remoulded, at so late a date? Would not the living witnesses and the early Christian converts, and after forty years these must have been many, have discredited or hindered the acceptance of such accounts? Loisy feels this difficulty, and thinks that we must come down to a time when the main actors, Jews, Christians, and Romans, were no more, and faith was not restrained by the memory of what had actually taken place. But how reconcile this with a gospel showing the influence of the Aramaic, and written about 70 A.D., that told of what must have been often repeated during many years, both by those who were actors in the history and by the larger numbers who had been their auditors? Whatever may be concluded as to the historical facts that lie back of the evangelical tradition, or back of any single section, the high age of the main content of the second gospel seems to be better established today than ever before. Advances in the knowledge of this early period following many lines tend thus far to increase rather than to diminish this possibility.

It may be urged that the Paulinism of the evangelist is against such a conclusion. We have seen that the gospel responds to Bacon's tests for Paulinism in nearly all its parts, and Loisy and others find it impregnated to a lesser extent. Aside from the fact that this same gospel has been found in the past to respond to very different tests, and from the fact that many skilled experimenters today can detect only slight traces of the Pauline element, it may be questioned whether another alternative has been sufficiently reckoned with. What if Paulinism shall be found to contain a strong infusion of primitive Christianity? Or what if it shall turn out that there was a pre-pauline doctrine akin to Paulinism? What if it shall be deemed wise eventually to confine the differences between the great apostle to the gentiles and his fellow-christians more nearly to the points that he himself mentions? Most of the arguments used by Bacon for Mark's

Paulinism may be, and have been, urged in favor of its primitive character. Especially is this true of the main argument, the form of the evangelist's message. What need could be earlier felt or more fundamental than the defence of Jesus' Messiahship? Does it seem probable that the apostles and elders of Jerusalem could presuppose faith in Christ rather than aim to produce it, that the didactic element in the tradition would be the all-important one for the churches of Palestine? Furthermore, does not the attitude toward the Jews, and the picture of the apostles, and of Jesus' kindred, suit an earlier age much better than any later one? Have we adequate reasons for substituting another historical background for one so well fitted to account for what follows? Are not the changes of the later Synoptists best explained as modifications of this earlier setting? It is evident that, prior to the question of the relation of Mark to primitive Christian tradition, there is the question of the relation of Paul to those who were apostles and disciples before him. If the second evangelist gives some evidence of being influenced by Pauline thought and teaching, this cannot be accounted strange. That, however, he was a pronounced partisan of the apostle, and that this motive shaped, yes, created his narrative, or even that such an influence is clearly traceable to any great extent, can hardly be said thus far to have been established. The assertion that we should have a very different gospel if it had been written by such a Paulinist, and according to the methods he is supposed to have employed, is not unfounded. To say that his Paulinism is that of a layman, that it was superficial, imperfect, and in part mistaken, hardly disposes of this objection. We thus conclude that the evidences of tendency and purpose hitherto adduced are not sufficient to give us important aid in separating out the sources of the second gospel from its present final form.

There is general agreement among the investigators named in this article, and among many others not mentioned, that we should look first of all to the second gospel itself rather than to the tradition of its origin for answers to the questions under discussion. The soundness of this position will probably be generally conceded. The gospel will continue to stand for what it is found to be in itself, whoever was the author or compiler. This does

not mean that the tradition of the Markan authorship is to be dismissed as without value. Indeed, it is generally accepted today in some form by eminent and impartial scholars. Johannes Weiss gives more attention to the question than do most recent writers on Mark. The difficulties and conflicting accounts in the oldest tradition, the question whether a distinction should be made between the author Mark and the John Mark of the New Testament, between the Mark of Peter and the Mark of Paul, are considered by him at length, and he finds the evidence such that he is willing neither to reject the prevailing assumption of their identity nor to affirm it. On the whole, he thinks the gospel best explained as coming from one who was a pupil of Peter and of Paul.

There is as much difference of opinion as ever as to the conclusion of Mark. Do the last twelve verses, which are so evidently from another and later hand, replace an ending that was accidentally lost, or one that was suppressed, or one that for some reason was never written? To these views, each of which has its advocates, we may add the further one, to which Loisy subscribes, that the gospel may have ended abruptly with 16 8, as it has come down to us in the oldest manuscripts. He finds it conceivable that the evangelist may have regarded the empty tomb, supplemented possibly by the account of the transfiguration, as the most convincing proof of the resurrection. He admits as possible the view that the evangelist contemplated a further narrative which was never written or has been lost. Bacon believes that the end of the gospel has been cancelled, either for dogmatic reasons or from lack of harmony with other accounts, and that the substitutes for this that have come down to us were supplied about 140 A.D. He says further, "It is as certain as anything in the field of critical conjecture can be that our evangelist's story once went on to relate the substance of the early narrative of Acts, and may even have wound up, as Acts does, with the planting of the gospel in *Rome*" (p. xix). Elsewhere he suggests that if the Roman evangelist himself did not continue his gospel, then we must suppose that there was current "some narrative corresponding to the more radical of the two main sources employed in Acts, perhaps represented in degenerate form in the later

'Acts,' 'Predications,' and 'Peregrinations' of Peter and Paul" (p. 234). Others, for example Zahn, are inclined to conjecture that our evangelist at least contemplated another and perhaps more extended writing, but Zahn does not express the degree of certainty regarding this that we find in Bacon. We may say that most scholars hold that the second gospel must have had some ending other than the present, but the hypothesis that the writer must have gone, or contemplated going, beyond the limits of the first, third, and fourth gospels, has far less probability, if it has any whatever.

Besides the question of the relation of Mark to Peter and to the Discourse-source (Q), there arises the further problem of its relation to the Johannine tradition, but up to the present this has not been widely discussed. Other points also, as yet little canvassed, will doubtless in due time assume a new importance. Meanwhile the progress recently made in the investigation of the second gospel and in the solution of the Synoptic Problem must be accounted most encouraging.